1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA 3 W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his) 5 capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL) OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and) 6 OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,) 7 in his capacity as the TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES) FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, 9 Plaintiff, 10)4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ vs. 11 TYSON FOODS, INC., et al, 12 Defendants. 13 14 VOLUME I OF THE VIDEOTAPED 15 DEPOSITION OF GLENN JOHNSON, PhD, produced as a 16 witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above 17 styled and numbered cause, taken on the 24th day of 18 February, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of 19 Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. 20 Steinmeyer, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly 21 certified under and by virtue of the laws of the 22 State of Oklahoma. 23 24 25

> TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS 918-587-2878

1

2

i		
1 2	A P P E A	R A N C E S
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:	Mr. David Page
4		Attorney at Law 502 West 6th Street Tulsa, OK 74119
5		idisa, OK /4115
6	FOR TYSON FOODS:	Mr. Robert George Attorney at Law
7		2210 West Oaklawn Drive Springdale, AR 72762
8 9	FOR CARGILL:	Mr. Kerry Lewis
10		Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400
11		Tulsa, OK 74103
12		Ms. Melissa Collins Attorney at Law
13		1700 Lincoln Street Suite 3200
14		Denver, CO 80203
15		
16	FOR SIMMONS FOODS:	Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street
17		Fayetteville, AR 72701
18		-
19	FOR PETERSON FARMS:	Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston
20		Suite 700 Tulsa, OK 74103
21		14154, 010 / 1105
22	FOR GEORGE'S:	Mr. James Graves Attorney at Law
23		221 North College Fayetteville, AR 72701
24		14,0000 v1110, 1110 /2/01
25	ALSO PRESENT:	Dr. Roger Olsen

Ι N D E X P A G E WITNESS GLENN JOHNSON, PhD Direct Examination by Mr. Page Signature Page Reporter's Certificate

194

1	waste	water treatment plant sample; is that the one	
2	that's	s left out?	
3	Q	There's three on the report here. Lincoln was	
4	a str	ream one also, was it not, Dr. Johnson?	
5	A	Yes, but	3:22PM
6	Q	These are the pure wastewater treatment plant	
7	efflue	ments.	
8		MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	
9	Q	Do you see three separate groups of patterns	
10	on th	is report as you circled? 03	3:23PM
11	A	I've drawn three circles here.	
12	Q	Do they overlap?	
13	A	No.	
14	Q	Okay. So is it fair to say there's three	
15	separa	rate groupings on this Exhibit 7?	3:23PM
16		MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	
17	A	Within the three context of the three groups	
18	you as	sked me to circle, there's no overlap between	
19	those	three. There's plenty of overlap between	
20	with t	the other samples.	3:23PM
21	Q	Well, the samples that are in the middle,	
22	would	they not be characterized as mixtures between	
23	these	e three	
24		MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	
25	Q	groups that you've circled?	3:23PM

```
1
        IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
2
                   NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
3
4
     W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )
5
     capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )
     OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and )
6
     OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE
     ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
7
     in his capacity as the
     TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
8
     FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
9
                  Plaintiff,
10
                                    )4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ
     VS.
11
     TYSON FOODS, INC., et al,
12
                  Defendants.
13
14
                       VOLUME II OF THE VIDEOTAPED
15
     DEPOSITION OF GLENN JOHNSON, PhD, produced as a
16
     witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above
17
     styled and numbered cause, taken on the 25th day of
18
     February, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of
19
     Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A.
20
     Steinmeyer, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly
21
     certified under and by virtue of the laws of the
22
     State of Oklahoma.
23
24
25
```

289

1	(Whereupon, the deposition began at	
2	8:32 a.m.)	
3	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.	
4	This is Volume II in the deposition of Dr. Glenn	
5	Johnson. It is Wednesday. The date is February 08:34	M
6	25th. The year is 2009. And would counsel present	
7	please identify themselves for the Record, please?	
8	MR. PAGE: David Page representing the	
9	State of Oklahoma, and with me is Dr. Olsen.	
10	MR. GEORGE: Robert George representing the 08:342	M
11	Tyson defendants.	
12	MR. LEWIS: Kerry Lewis on behalf of the	
13	Cargill defendants.	
14	MR. GRAVES: James Graves representing	
15	George's, Inc., and George's Farms, Inc. 08:342	M
16	GLENN JOHNSON, PhD	
17	having first been duly sworn to testify the truth,	
18	the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified	
19	as follows:	
20	CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION	
21	BY MR. PAGE:	
22	Q Good morning, Dr. Johnson.	
23	A Good morning.	
24	Q Do you realize you are still under oath this	
25	morning? 08:34	M

299

1	correct	=?	
2	A	That's correct.	
3	Q	And that is because you reviewed some poultry	
4	house o	density, at least partly because you reviewed	
5	some po	oultry house density information, and you	08:47AM
6	found t	that it did not comport with Dr. Olsen's	
7	classi	fication under PC1; correct?	
8	A	Yes. Many of the samples were not consistent	
9	with h	is interpretation.	
10	Q	And you provided some information in your	08:47AM
11	report	some examples of that in your report;	
12	correct	: ?	
13	A	Yes, I did.	
14	Q	Okay. Now, I think yesterday you said you got	
15	a poult	try house map of density from a group called	08:47AM
16	what?		
17	A	DPRA.	
18	Q	Is there anyone from DPRA that is providing an	
19	expert	report in this case that you're aware of?	
20	A	Not that I know of.	08:48AM
21	Q	Okay, and did you do any independent	
22	evaluat	tion to determine whether the information they	
23	provide	ed you was in fact the poultry house density	
24	informa	ation that Dr. Olsen used for his spatial	
25	analysi	is?	08:48AM

300

1	
1	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.
2	A Yes, I did.
3	Q And what did you do to evaluate that?
4	A I compared the map that was based on those GIS
5	shape files to Figure 2.51 of his map. 08:48AM
6	Q Okay. Figure 2.51 in his map was a map that
7	he used to, early on in the case, to identify
8	preliminarily some groundwater sampling location, is
9	it not?
10	MR. GEORGE: Object to form. 08:48AM
11	A I believe it was in the context of
12	groundwater, yes.
13	Q Okay. Do you know whether that particular map
14	was used for his poultry house density evaluation in
15	his PCA analysis? 08:49AM
16	A I do not know that. He did not indicate which
17	poultry house density data layer he used in that
18	part of his evaluation and he did not present a
19	poultry house density map within his PCA evaluation.
20	Q Well, if this was important to you, why didn't 08:49AM
21	you ask doctor doctor Mr. George to ask a
22	question concerning the poultry house density
23	information Dr. Olsen used in his deposition?
24	MR. GEORGE: Object to form. I did ask
25	that question. Answer, if you can. 08:49AM

319

1	VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the Record. The time is	
2	9:12.	
3	(Following a short recess at 9:12 a.m.,	
4	proceedings continued on the Record at 9:19 a.m.)	
5	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the Record. 09:18AM	
6	The time is 9:19.	
7	Q Dr. Johnson, during the break, I put before	
8	you what's been marked as Exhibit 13, and let me	
9	represent to you the basis for this document. This	
10	document is a portion of an aerial photograph that 09:19AM	
11	was prepared by the State in this case and produced	
12	to the defendants approximately a year ago. It was	
13	also the aerial photograph that was ground truthed	
14	by investigators for the State of Oklahoma. All of	
15	this is outlined in Dr. Fisher's report. This 09:19AM	
16	aerial photograph then took the locations, two of	
17	the locations you discussed in your report and we've	
18	been talking about, Lincoln wastewater treatment	
19	plant, and then you used the GIS program to draw the	
20	watershed or the drainage area, the subwatershed to 09:20AM	
21	the drainage area that would go to that location.	
22	Also on this map there are areas of red circles	
23	where the State's investigation ground truthed	
24	active poultry house locations.	
25	A Okay. 09:20AM	

320

1	Q Active or inactive poultry house locations.	
2	MR. GEORGE: Yeah. David, can you be clear	
3	there? Are you representing these are active?	
4	MR. PAGE: Active or inactive.	
5	MR. GEORGE: Active or inactive, okay.	09:20AM
6	MR. PAGE: Uh-huh.	
7	Q And finally there's a brown square area where	
8	the State has reviewed the records of the Oklahoma	
9	Department of Agriculture and Forestry, and that's	
10	where it's documented land application has occurred.	09:20AM
11	MR. GEORGE: David, can I ask a couple of	
12	questions to see if we can get some clarity around	
13	this document? You represented that this photograph	
14	has been produced previously by the State in the	
15	case.	09:21AM
16	MR. PAGE: Yes.	
17	MR. GEORGE: And when you say when you	
18	make that representation, you're referring to the	
19	underlying image; is that correct?	
20	MR. PAGE: The photograph, yeah. Not the	09:21AM
21	lines that have been overlaid on the photograph.	
22	MR. GEORGE: To your knowledge, is today	
23	the first time when the State has produced an aerial	
24	photograph, such as what we've put in front of the	
25	witness as Exhibit 13, that includes the sample	09:21AM

321

1	locations that are shown, the outline of areas of
2	identified land application and the circling in red
3	of active or inactive poultry houses?
4	MR. PAGE: All this information that
5	underlies this exhibit has been produced by the 09:21AM
6	State of Oklahoma
7	MR. GEORGE: My question is whether or not
8	
9	MR. PAGES: in different forms.
10	MR. GEORGE: Well, I understand that, but 09:21AM
11	prior to today, David, has there been a production
12	of a map that reflects all of the information shown
13	in Exhibit 13 in the form in which you have
14	presented it to this witness?
15	MR. PAGE: I don't know whether it has or 09:22AM
16	not.
17	MR. GEORGE: Okay. I'm going to challenge
18	this as obvious expert analysis that's been done
19	after the expert disclosure deadline and not a part
20	of any production of considered materials or 09:22AM
21	MR. PAGE: No.
22	MR. GEORGE: production of documents in
23	this case.
24	MR. PAGE: These materials were part of
25	considered materials for Dr. Olsen excuse me, Dr. 09:22AM

322

1		
1	Fisher and Dr. Engel and also part of Dr. Olsen's	
2	considered materials.	
3	MR. GEORGE: Can you point can you	
4	provide me to a reference in either Dr. Olsen or	
5	MR. PAGE: Not at this time.	09:22AM
6	MR. GEORGE: Hang on, hang on. Let me	
7	finish. I'm wanting the Record to be clear that if	
8	I search Dr. Olsen or Dr. Fisher's expert materials,	
9	which I have, I will not find I will not find	
10	Exhibit 13?	09:22AM
11	MR. PAGE: I'll show you an example. Mark	
12	this.	
13	MR. GRAVES: It's not a complex issue. Has	
14	this piece of paper been produced in the case?	
15	A Is that for me to look at?	09:23AM
16	Q Yeah.	
17	MR. GEORGE: David, are you going to answer	
18	James' question?	
19	MR. PAGE: No, I'm not going to answer his	
20	question.	09:23AM
21	MR. GEORGE: Okay. We'll take that as a	
22	representation that it hasn't been produced.	
23	MR. PAGE: Well, I'm going to show you that	
24	it has been produced.	
25	MR. GRAVES: If I go through Dr. Olsen's	09:23AM

323

1	considered materials, am I going to find a Bates	
2	numbered Olsen document that looks like this?	
3	MR. PAGE: You're going to find the	
4	MR. GRAVES: That's not what I asked. Am I	
5	going to find one that looks like this?	9:23AM
6	MR. PAGE: I don't know, James, off the top	
7	of my head.	
8	MR. GRAVES: Okay. That's what I wanted to	
9	know.	
10	MR. PAGE: But I do know this: All of this)9:23AM
11	information	
12	MR. GRAVES: I didn't ask about this.	
13	MR. PAGE: was produced	
14	COURT REPORTER: You guys, one at a time.	
15	MR. PAGE: in maps in different pieces	9:23AM
16	of expert reports.	
17	Q For example, I'm going to show you Exhibit 14.	
18	This was part of Dr. Fisher's report. Did you ever	
19	review this information concerning poultry house	
20	land application?	9:23AM
21	MR. GRAVES: Before he answers the	
22	question, I'm going to finish the objection and	
23	finish making the Record.	
24	MR. PAGE: Well, then make your objections,	
25	but you're not here to ask me questions about what's	9:24AM

324

1	in the Record.
2	MR. GRAVES: I needed to know the answer to
3	the question to know whether it was objectionable.
4	I appreciate you being candid that you don't know
5	whether or not this piece of paper has been produced 09:24AM
6	as part of any of the considered materials in this
7	case. This particular piece of paper, as Mr. George
8	started down the path while ago, is clearly
9	analysis. It may be based on information that's
10	been produced previously, but this document has not 09:24AM
11	been produced previously, and it's based on analysis
12	that's been done after the expert deadline.
13	MR. PAGE: Let me just make for the Record
14	clear
15	MR. GRAVES: So I object and move to strike 09:24AM
16	it.
17	MS. COLLINS: Join.
18	MR. PAGE: that this particular document
19	was put together as a rebuttal for the work that was
20	performed by Dr. Johnson that we got on December 09:24AM
21	1st. It's taking his map that we've already
22	reviewed and taking the information that was
23	available to him on his map and overlaying it,
24	showing what information was available. It's
25	clearly a rebuttal exhibit. 09:24AM

1	MR. GRAVES: And the court has has
2	barred rebuttal expert information in this case and
3	supplemental expert analysis in this case.
4	MR. PAGE: I think you're mistaken what the
5	court has ruled in this case. 09:25AM
6	MR. GRAVES: I'm not mistaken. I wrote the
7	motion and read the order. So I'm going to move to
8	strike it, and now you can ask your questions.
9	Q Did you ever review Exhibit 14?
10	A I don't recall seeing this exhibit. 09:25AM
11	Q It was do you recall seeing it in Dr.
12	Fisher's report?
13	A No, I don't.
14	Q Do you see that Exhibit 14 identifies areas of
15	land application? 09:25AM
16	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.
17	A Yes. The legend indicates that red or beige
18	squares are reported poultry waste application
19	areas.
20	Q And can you tell whether some of those squares 09:25AM
21	are also represented on Exhibit 13?
22	A This looks like a blow-up of a portion of the
23	whole basin near Lincoln. And the gold shaded box
24	appear to be consistent with the gold shaded box on
25	Exhibit 14. 09:26AM

326

1	Q Do you know whether or not the records that	
2	document poultry land application document all the	
3	land application or just a portion of the land	
4	application that's occurred in that area?	
5	A You mean on that map? I'm sorry. What was	09:26AM
6	the question?	
7	Q The records well, this map, Exhibit 14, is	
8	based on Oklahoma Department of Agriculture and	
9	Forestry records.	
10	A Okay.	09:26AM
11	Q And my question to you is, do you know whether	
12	or not these records include all the land	
13	applications that have occurred within the watershed	
14	or just some of them?	
15	A I don't know what those represent beyond what	09:27AM
16	is written on the legend of that map.	
17	Q Okay, and the areas of just to make the	
18	Record clear, the areas that are in the Arkansas	
19	portion are based on nutrient management plan and	
20	application records produced by the defendants in	09:27AM
21	this case.	
22	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	
23	A Is that a representation or a question?	
24	Q That's a representation just so you know. I	
25	before said all of this was on Department of	09:27AM

327

i			Ī
_			
1	_	ulture and Forestry, but the Arkansas portion	
2	is bas	sed on other records.	
3	A	May I take a look again?	
4	Q	Sure.	
5	A	So you're telling me that the gold boxes on	09:27AM
6	Exhib	it 14 on the Oklahoma side, that data came from	
7	a diff	ferent source from that on the Arkansas side?	
8	Q	That's correct.	
9	A	Which explains why we have what we call a	
10	county	y line fault running	09:27AM
11	Q	Yes, sir.	
12	A	All right. I think I understand.	
13	Q	Thank you. Now, let's turn back to Exhibit	
14	13. I	Do you see where there's a subwatershed now	
15	shown	for the Lincoln wastewater treatment plant	09:28AM
16	sampli	ing point?	
17	A	Yes.	
18	Q	And could you identify that for the Record;	
19	could	you just describe that for us, please, for the	
20	Record	1?	09:28AM
21	A	The Lincoln wastewater treatment plant sample	
22	point	is on Bush Creek south of Lincoln and south of	
23	Lincol	In wastewater treatment plant.	
24	Q	And is it outlined on this map by a green and	
25	white	dotted area that begins at the Lincoln	09:28AM

328

1	wastewater treatment plant red dot sampling
2	location?
3	A I'm sorry. Is it it begins here. Your
4	question was it outlined?
5	Q Yes. 09:28AM
6	A Yes. It's outlined by green and white.
7	Q And within that location you just identified,
8	do you see any poultry houses identified within that
9	area?
10	A Again, the red circles indicate poultry houses 09:28AM
11	either active or inactive?
12	Q Yes.
13	A Yes.
14	Q And do you also see numerous poultry houses
15	immediately around the area at this watershed? 09:28AM
16	A Yes, in different subbasins.
17	\mathbf{Q} Would this information indicate to you that
18	this is an area of low poultry house density that
19	you're seeing on Exhibit 13?
20	A It would indicate that it is not zero. The 09:29AM
21	number of poultry houses per acre, where it would
22	fall in that quintile color range chart, I couldn't
23	tell based on just visual inspection.
24	Q Do you see that the watershed that was set out
25	in I think it's Figure 3-5 of your report is 09:29AM

329

1	different than that what is evaluated here using the
2	GIS model to identify drainage areas to sampling
3	point?
4	A What page are you on there?
5	Q It's Page 39. 09:30AM
6	A Thank you.
7	MR. GEORGE: David, while he's turning, did
8	you mark this Exhibit 14?
9	MR. PAGE: Yes.
10	MR. GEORGE: Okay, and with respect to 09:30AM
11	Exhibit 14, I do recall seeing the outline of the
12	watershed with the 40-acre blocks that are if I
13	recall that correctly, maybe they're larger than
14	that shaded in orange. I don't recall seeing a
15	map that had the sample locations plotted over the 09:30AM
16	top of that. Has this exact map been produced
17	previously or was it prepared for this deposition?
18	MR. PAGE: The sampling points were added
19	for this deposition.
20	MR. GEORGE: Okay. So the map in the exact 09:30AM
21	form of Exhibit 14 had not been produced prior to
22	today; is that correct?
23	MR. PAGE: In the exact the underlying
24	information has all been produced. The exact
25	creation of this map has not. It was prepared for 09:30AM

330 rebuttal. 1 2 MR. GEORGE: Okay. Move to strike. MS. COLLINS: Join. 3 MR. GEORGE: I'm sorry, we may have lost 4 the question in that. Did you recall it, Dr. 09:31AM 5 6 Johnson? 7 I thought the question was, is there a difference in how the subbasins are indicated on 8 9 this air photo as compared to the -- to the waste -to the poultry house base layer that I used for my 10 09:31AM maps and, yes, there is a difference. 11 Now, did you have some of your own data that 12 13 you could have done a similar analysis concerning poultry house density other than what I've shown you 14 in Exhibit 13? 09:31AM 15 MR. GEORGE: Object to form. 16 Did I have data beyond what is --17 18 Well, there's been a lot of objections about 19 this data as being first presented here today or at least the map as represented. Isn't it true, sir, 09:31AM 20 that you your own -- had to your own -- your own 21 22 information provided by DPRA that showed poultry house density in this area? 23 24 I don't recall if there were --25 MS. COLLINS: Can we get another copy of 09:32AM

331

1	the exhibit right before this?
2	MR. GEORGE: 14?
3	MS. COLLINS: 14. It's the one with the
4	reported poultry waste application. I gave mine to
5	him. 09:32AM
6	MR. GEORGE: Which means she won't get it
7	back. I stole it.
8	MS. COLLINS: Correct.
9	Q Dr. Johnson, I've handed you what's been
10	marked as Exhibit 15. Can you identify that 09:33AM
11	document for the Record, please, sir?
12	A This looks like one of the air photo base map
13	provided by DPRA that we've been discussing.
14	Q Okay, and does this information come from your
15	considered materials? 09:33AM
16	A It has a Bates stamp of Glenn Johnson, so,
17	yes, it did.
18	Q Did you review this
19	A Yes.
20	Q when you were evaluating Dr. Olsen's 09:33AM
21	poultry house density when you created criticism
22	that's set forth in Figure 3-5?
23	A Yes, I did.
24	MR. GEORGE: David, has the document been
25	manipulated from his considered materials in any 09:33AM

1	way?	
2	MR. PAGE: It's reproduced; it's printed	
3	except	
4	MR. GEORGE: The red circles?	
5	MR PAGE: Except the red circle has been	
6	added.	
7	MR. GEORGE: Okay. Just so we make a clear	
8	Record, the document that's been put in front of the	
9	witness has been altered by the State's experts,	
10	including red circles on is it; is that correct?	09:34AM
11	MR. PAGE: Yes. We took the information	
12	that's found in Exhibit 13 on poultry house	
13	identification, which is the ground truthing of the	
14	poultry house aerial photo, and then transferred	
15	that identification to Exhibit 15.	09:34AM
16	MR. GEORGE: Okay. Move to strike.	
17	Q Do you note, Dr. Johnson, that there is quite	
18	a few poultry houses shown on the aerial photo that	
19	you had in your possession at the time you were	
20	doing the analysis of Dr. Olsen's PCA?	09:34AM
21	A Yes.	
22	Q Why did you ignore all these poultry houses in	
23	this area when you claimed that Dr. Olsen's poultry	
24	house density analysis did not comport with his PCA	
25	analysis?	09:35AM

333

1	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	
2	A Because my understanding was that as part of	
3	Dr. Fisher's analysis, he determined which ones were	
4	active and which ones were inactive, and I believe	
5	if this is part of the same photo base that you	09:35AM
6	represented that some of these are active and some	
7	of these are inactive.	
8	Q Uh-huh.	
9	A The base layer was ultimately shaded green.	
10	So I did not go back and review all the details of	09:35AM
11	Fisher's analysis, but based on that, given how the	
12	analysis is representative of being done, I figured	
13	that he determined that these were inactive or they	
14	would not have the subbasin would not have been	
15	colored green.	09:35AM
16	Q Is it your position, sir, that inactive	
17	poultry houses do not contribute to the constituents	
18	that are seen as potential contaminants in the IRW?	
19	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	
20	A It's my understanding that was the reason for	09:35AM
21	making the distinction between active and inactive	
22	poultry houses, so, yes.	
23	Q What's the basis for that assumption?	
24	Wouldn't a formerly used poultry house also	
25	contribute to contamination based on generation of	09:36AM

334

1	waste that would be land applied near the poultry
2	house?
3	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.
4	A I don't know the extent to which poultry waste
5	from an inactive house might be spread in the same 09:36AM
6	manner that or even if it still exists, if
7	there's still poultry waste in such a house. I
8	don't know.
9	Q And you don't know whether or not previous
10	land application of poultry to a particular field 09:36AM
11	does not increase contaminants in that field?
12	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.
13	A Could you repeat the question, please?
14	(Whereupon, the court reporter read
15	back the previous question.) 09:37AM
16	A With the hypothetical that it was applied at
17	some point in the past doesn't inform me on the
18	extent to which it is impacting stream water
19	collected at present.
20	Q Did you do any investigation in that regard? 09:37AM
21	A My reading of Dr. Olsen's report was that
22	was that the poultry house density as represented on
23	these maps were a surrogate for poultry house land
24	application, and if they were making a distinction
25	between active and inactive, I'm not sure why they 09:37AM

335

1	would make that distinction if the presumption was	
2	that you were that that poultry litter was	
3	still being applied from both active and inactive	
4	houses.	
5	Q Well, the distinction the point is, Dr.	09:38AM
6	Johnson, cannot past application of waste to a land	
7	field create an accumulation of those wastes that	
8	could continue to run off of that field over a	
9	period of time long after the source of the	
10	generation of the waste is gone?	09:38AM
11	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	
12	A All things are possible.	
13	Q You've never seen that situation in your own	
14	investigation where previous releases continue to	
15	release into the stream?	09:38AM
16	A I have seen it.	
17	Q You have seen it?	
18	A Yes.	
19	Q So that wouldn't surprise you to find that?	
20	A It doesn't surprise me but, I mean, if this	09:38AM
21	was a major concern, why collect the Lincoln	
22	wastewater treatment plant sample in a stream at	
23	this location? I mean, I don't think I'm going out	
24	on a limb that when the plaintiff's expert collects	
25	a sample in a stream with the name Lincoln	09:38AM

336

1	wastewater treatment plant, that the design was to
2	have a sample that represented output from a
3	wastewater treatment plant and
4	Q Did you see anything in Dr. Olsen's
5	MR. GEORGE: Hang on, David, let him 09:39AM
6	finish. Were you done?
7	MR. PAGE: We're running out of
8	MR. GEORGE: Were you done?
9	Q Did you see anything in Dr. Olsen's report
10	that would indicate that he couldn't get any closer 09:39AM
11	access to Lincoln wastewater treatment plant than
12	the point at which he took the sample?
13	A I don't recall seeing that, but if that was
14	the issue, then if that was the issue, then by
15	by taking the sample and naming it Lincoln 09:39AM
16	wastewater treatment plant, he had must have had
17	some reason to believe that that's what it was
18	representing.
19	Q Based on the poultry houses you see on Exhibit
20	15, is it conceivable that these poultry house 09:39AM
21	operations would impact the the waters that are
22	sampled at the Lincoln wastewater treatment plant
23	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.
24	Q location?
25	A Again, all things are possible, but we have a 09:40AM

340

1	report, although you had it, to determine what the	
2	latest and greatest map was; correct?	
3	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	
4	A Well, I just said that I did not review	
5	Fisher's report, but, again, I did presume that the	09:58AM
6	single poultry house density map that did appear in	
7	Olsen's report would have been related to that work.	
8	Q Did you realize that in Section 2 of Dr.	
9	Olsen's report there was a whole list of poultry	
10	house density maps that were created during the	09:58AM
11	course of this litigation?	
12	A I don't recall that section.	
13	Q Before you is Exhibit 16, Dr. Johnson.	
14	A Okay.	
15	Q And I'll make the same representations I did	09:58AM
16	with respect to Exhibit 13.	
17	MR. GEORGE: Can I have a copy, please?	
18	MR. PAGE: I thought I put it in front of	
19	you during the break. Melissa might have grabbed	
20	it.	09:58AM
21	MR. GEORGE: Oh, okay. Thank you. David,	
22	I assume that the story behind the production of	
23	Exhibit 16 is the same that we've discussed with the	
24	prior Exhibits 13, 14 and 15; is that right?	
25	MR. PAGE: I don't understand what you mean	09:59AM

341

1	by the story. I'm saying that I'm making the same
2	representations as to the information that's on the
3	map.
4	MR. GEORGE: Okay. Move to strike,
5	untimely expert analysis. 09:59AM
6	A I'm sorry, did you ask a question?
7	Q No. I was waiting until you had a chance to
8	look at it. Can you identify where the let me
9	let's turn first to your report, Page 51. What is
10	your criticism with regard to Page 51 in your 09:59AM
11	report, in particular Figure 3-12?
12	A Well, similar to HFS 22, this particular
13	sample had a PC1 score greater than 1.3. It's
14	reported on the figure as 1.5. According to Dr.
15	Olsen's PCA classification, that would be poultry 10:00AM
16	impacted. A PC1 of 1.5 is the average score of
17	multiple samples.
18	Q Okay. Would you now look to Exhibit 16?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Isn't it possible that the poultry houses and 10:00AM
21	the poultry land application that's shown on Exhibit
22	16 would account for Dr. Olsen's PC score as
23	reported on Page 51 of your report?
24	MS. COLLINS: Object to form.
25	A Certainly it's possible. It's also possible 10:00AM

345

1	some differences with respect to what I plotted, not	
2	in this basin if I recall this subbasin if I	
3	recall correctly. So your question was, what other	
4	poultry house density data? So at least two of the	
5	iterations of the poultry house density layer showed	10:04AM
6	this. In addition, I believe you asked what other	
7	poultry house density data. I believe the contract	
8	growers, which was in my production material, there	
9	was also poultry house density data that I produced	
10	there.	10:04AM
11	Q Did you find poultry houses within the	
12	watershed defined by HFS 05 in Exhibit 16 based on	
13	the poultry house growers' data?	
14	A I don't recall.	
15	Q Would that have been important to you one way	10:05AM
16	or the other if you had it?	
17	A Ultimately there were differences in the map.	
18	Rather than even start to engage in an argument over	
19	whose poultry house density data were was correct	
20	and which one wasn't, it seemed to make for a	10:05AM
21	simpler story to adopt the one that I thought both	
22	sides agreed on was accurate. Doesn't appear to	
23	have worked out very well.	
24	Q Let me mark another exhibit for you. Let me	
25	hand you what is marked as Johnson Exhibit 17. Can	10:05AM

346

1	you identify that for the Record, sir?	
2	A Yes. This is the this is a map generated	
3	by DPRA, analogous to the figure we were just	
4	looking at in my report, except the base layer is an	
5	air photo.	10:06AM
6	Q Okay. So you had well, does Exhibit 16 and	
7	17 show the same watershed?	
8	A I believe it does.	
9	Q Okay, and so you had Exhibit 17 available to	
10	you at the time you wrote your report and your	10:06AM
11	conclusions for Figure 3-12; correct?	
12	A That's correct.	
13	MR. GEORGE: David, before we go further	
14	with this exhibit, once again can I get confirmation	
15	that Exhibit 17 has been altered from as it appeared	10:06AM
16	in Dr. Johnson's considered materials by the	
17	insertion of red circles on the document by someone	
18	working for the State of Oklahoma?	
19	MR. PAGE: The red circles have been added	
20	to Johnson's considered document as shown in the	10:07AM
21	Bates number based on the information that was	
22	presented in Dr. Fisher's report.	
23	MR. GEORGE: Where is the Bates number, by	
24	the way? Maybe that's	
25	MS. COLLINS: Right here.	10:07AM

347

1	MR. GEORGE: Thank you.	
2	Q Did you ignore these poultry houses	
3	A No.	
4	MR. GEORGE: I'm sorry. Move to strike	
5	Exhibit 17. Go ahead. 10:07AM	
6	Q Did you ignore these poultry houses when you	
7	concluded Dr. Olsen's spatial analysis was did	
8	not support his PC1 scores?	
9	A I did not ignore them. I saw them. I	
10	discounted them as indicative of poultry impact, and 10:07AM	
11	this map provides a perfect example. We have	
12	poultry houses within the subbasin just to the south	
13	of HFS 05, and looking at this map, the fact that it	
14	ended up with a green color, indicating zero poultry	
15	house density, led me to believe that Fisher or one 10:07AM	
16	of his people or somebody else on the plaintiff's	
17	side determined that these were inactive or	
18	abandoned or whatever criteria he used and that	
19	these ones were somehow were active.	
20	Q But you didn't check Dr. Fisher's report to 10:08AM	
21	test your assumption, did you?	
22	A Again, no.	
23	Q Okay. Why didn't you did you mention	ſ
24	anything in your report that the aerial photos does	ſ
25	indicate some poultry houses that could be observed 10:08AM	ſ

351

1	Q Did you have aerial photo available for you
2	when you did this analysis?
3	A Again, I believe DPRA generated a similar air
4	photo base map.
5	Q And do you recall whether you observed 10:13AM
6	numerous poultry houses on the air photo that you
7	were provided by DPRA?
8	A I believe I observed at least one. I don't
9	know if it was numerous or not.
10	MR. ELROD: Do you have an extra one of 10:14AM
11	these?
12	MS. COLLINS: We're on 16 still; right?
13	MR. ELROD: Siloam.
14	MR. PAGE: I'm going to 17 now.
15	MR. ELROD: Yeah. 10:14AM
16	MR. GEORGE: He's on Figure 3-14.
17	MR PAGE: I haven't marked it yet.
18	MR. ELROD: We're on what page of the
19	report?
20	MR. GEORGE: Page 53. David, before we get 10:14AM
21	to Exhibit 18, the explanation for the creation of
22	this document is the same as Exhibits 13, 14, 15, 16
23	and 17 that we've been discussing; is that right?
24	Q I'm going to represent to you, Dr. Johnson,
25	that the information that created Exhibit No. 5 is 10:15AM

352

1	the same information that was used to create Exhibit	
2	8 excuse me, 13. I think we're missing some but	
3	certainly it's the same as 13.	
4	A Okay.	
5	MR. GEORGE: David, just so the Record is	10:15AM
6	clear, Exhibit 18 was not included in Dr. Olsen's	
7	considered materials and was produced in preparation	
8	for this deposition; is that right?	
9	MR. PAGE: The information underlying	
10	this	10:15AM
11	MR. GEORGE: That's not my question, David.	
12	MR. PAGE: Well	
13	MR. GEORGE: I know I know you want to	
14	avoid the question, but that's not the question.	
15	MR. PAGE: I'm not trying to avoid the	10:15AM
16	question. I think you are interrupting my	
17	deposition.	
18	MR. GEORGE: I'm making a Record.	
19	MR. PAGE: I made it perfectly clear what	
20	the source of this information is.	10:15AM
21	Q So, Doctor	
22	MR. GEORGE: Hang on. Unless you tell me	
23	otherwise, I'm going to assume that Exhibit 18 was	
24	created in preparation for this deposition and does	
25	not appear in this form in any expert production or	10:16AM

353

1	in any production by the State of Oklahoma prior to
2	today, and on that basis, unless you want to
3	challenge that, I move to strike it.
4	MR. PAGE: Okay. What I've told you
5	earlier is that I told you what I know how this 10:16AM
6	information was prepared. I cannot represent to you
7	today whether a document similar to this was one of
8	the other fifteen expert reports produced by the
9	defendants.
10	MR. GEORGE: Okay.
11	MR. PAGE: We prepared this document for
12	rebuttal on Dr. Johnson's report
13	MR. GEORGE: Okay.
14	MR. PAGE: using information, the base
15	layer information that was all provided in other 10:16AM
16	I know in other expert reports in this case.
17	MR. GEORGE: It's rebuttal analysis that
18	the court has already determined to be improper in
19	this case, and that's why I renew my motion to
20	strike. 10:16AM
21	MR. PAGE: I can see why you wouldn't want
22	to have this information before the court.
23	MR. GEORGE: Move to strike the
24	characterization of this document unless you want to
25	give a deposition and testify about it. 10:17AM

354

1	MR. GRAVES: And we can see that the State
2	continues to disregard the court's orders if we want
3	to make sound bytes here, Mr. Page.
4	MR. PAGE: I think, Mr. James, the court
5	said that
6	MR. GRAVES: I am not Mr James.
7	MR. PAGE: I'm sorry, Mr. Graves, that the
8	court made it very clear that rebuttal evidence
9	would be allowed in this case if it was rebuttal
10	evidence. That's my recall. 10:17AM
11	MR. GRAVES: We can agree to disagree about
12	what the court ordered in that regard.
13	MR. PAGE: Okay.
14	Q In any event, you still get the opportunity to
15	answer questions today. 10:17AM
16	A Wonderful.
17	Q So, Dr. Johnson, given those same
18	representations, can you identify the HFS 04
19	watershed on Exhibit 18 that you also were looking
20	into in your Figure 3-14? 10:17AM
21	A Yeah. This is an air photo of base map of
22	showing locations HFS 04 and RS 336 in and around
23	Siloam Springs.
24	Q And is the sample location identified on the
25	base map? 10:18AM

361

1	did you not, before you wrote your report?	
2	A Yes.	
3	Q Let me show you what's been marked as Exhibit	
4	19. Is that the photo you had before you wrote your	
5	conclusions for Figure 3-14?	10:25AM
6	MR. GEORGE: Let me make a Record on the	
7	exhibit first. Exhibit 19 is, once again, a	
8	document that has been altered through the work of	
9	an expert for the State of Oklahoma from the	
10	production in Dr. Fisher's considered materials.	10:25AM
11	It's untimely expert analysis I'm sorry, Dr.	
12	Johnson's considered materials. It's untimely	
13	analysis; therefore, we move to strike it. Now go	
14	ahead with the answer.	
15	A I lost the question.	10:26AM
16	Q Fortunately she records it.	
17	(Whereupon, the court reporter read	
18	back the previous question.)	
19	A 3-14, yes.	
20	Q And does it depict the HFS 04 watershed	10:26AM
21	similar to what we've observed on Exhibit 18?	
22	A Yes, it's a very similar shape.	
23	Q Okay, and do you observe poultry houses within	
24	the aerial photo that you had in your possession as	
25	Exhibit 19?	10:26AM

364

1	A I don't believe so. I don't recall that DPRA	
2	had an air photo base map, so, no.	
3	Q Okay. Well, you understood that DPRA did	
4	you know whether or not DPRA could have provided you	
5	an aerial photo base map for this location?	10:30AM
6	A They probably could have.	
7	Q Did you ask for one?	
8	A No.	
9	Q Why not?	
10	A I believe I wrote this section of report after	10:30AM
11	they had generated those earlier maps, and I had the	
12	base layers available to plot this map myself, so I	
13	did not need their assistance.	
14	Q I'll show you what's marked as Exhibit 20, and	
15	I'll make the same representations that I did with	10:31AM
16	Exhibit 13 concerning the source of this	
17	information.	
18	MR. GEORGE: Same objection and move to	
19	strike, untimely expert analysis.	
20	Q Looking at this map, Dr. Johnson, can you	10:31AM
21	identify the watershed that relates to sampling	
22	location SN-SBC2?	
23	A Yes. If all the legend information is the	
24	same, it would be a red and green striped line	
25	generally to the north of SN-SBC2.	10:31AM

371

1		MR. ELROD: Go ahead.	
2	A	He indicated that in deposition. Your	
3	questic	on was in his report and his deposition.	
4	Q	Yeah.	
5	A	He indicated it in deposition.	10:40AM
6	Q	Okay. So I imagine we found a few things out	
7	that yo	ou said in your deposition that were not also	
8	in your	report; correct?	
9		MR. GEORGE: Object.	
10	A	Yes.	10:40AM
11	Q	Okay. So if you were faced with this type of	
12	an anom	maly in your environmental investigation, even	
13	though	you had already issued your expert report and	
14	perhaps	given your deposition, would you continue	
15	your ev	valuation and try to explain the anomaly?	10:40AM
16	A	Yes, I would.	
17	Q	Dr. Johnson, I have placed before you Exhibit	
18	No. 21.	. It's an aerial photo which has an outline	
19	of the	watersheds or the land area that drains to	
20	RBS 578	3. Do you see that, sir?	10:41AM
21	A	Yes.	
22	Q	And these are it has all five of the	
23	samplin	ng locations that are within the city area of	
24	Tahlequ	uah; correct?	
25	A	Correct.	10:41AM

372

1	Q	This watershed also has some information	
2	conce	rning poultry land application, does it not?	
3	A	Again, we have the gold or brown areas	
4	indica	ating that.	
5	Q	Okay. If the investigation in this case	10:42AM
6	deter	mined that there was documented land	
7	applio	cation in the areas of gold or brown squares,	
8	could	that account for the higher PC1 scores at the	
9	sampl:	ing locations identified on Exhibit 21?	
10		MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	10:42AM
11	A	No.	
12	Q	It would not?	
13	A	No.	
14	Q	Why not?	
15	A	Because PC1 is related to iron and aluminum	10:42AM
16	and pa	articulate matter, not to any particular	
17	source	e. It	
18		MR. GEORGE: I'm sorry, go ahead.	
19	A	The fact that you that we have three areas	
20	at the	e upstream edge of this basin where there's	10:42AM
21	purpo	rtedly poultry litter poultry litter	
22	applie	ed, that may indicate one of several possible	
23	source	es, but we still have these I don't see any	
24	evide	nce that allows me to discount other sources	
25	from t	this urban area.	10:43AM

373

1	Q But poultry then could be a potential source	
2	contributing to those locations if these are in fact	
3	documented land application areas; do you agree with	
4	that?	
5	MR. GEORGE: Object to form.	10:43AM
6	A They're upstream. Constituents from that area	
7	could get to those stream areas, as could any other	
8	source of phosphorus or bacteria up this stream.	
9	MR. GEORGE: Let me make a Record first	
10	with respect to Exhibit 21, Mr. Page, that I assume	10:43AM
11	this is, again, not a document that was included in	
12	Dr. Olsen or any other expert's production of	
13	considered materials and that it was prepared after	
14	the submission of the expert report in connection	
15	with your preparation for this deposition, and in	10:43AM
16	light of that, I move to strike it as untimely	
17	expert analysis, and one point of clarification on	
18	this map, if I could secure one, the outlined gold	
19	areas, could you provide the source of that	
20	information?	10:44AM
21	MR. PAGE: They're documented land	
22	application locations.	
23	MR. GEORGE: Documented by whom?	
24	MR. PAGE: I don't recall.	
25	MR. GEORGE: Documented in ODAFF records?	10:44AM

374

1	MR. PAGE: I believe there's ODAFF records,	
2	an investigator my recollection is, Mr. George,	
3	is that the documentation is based on ODAFF records	
4	and individual observations from investigators.	
5	MR. GEORGE: Have the records associated	10:44AM
6	with the investigation of these land application	
7	areas that are shown in Exhibit 21 been produced in	
8	this case prior to today?	
9	MR. PAGE: Yes, sir, that is my	
10	understanding.	10:44AM
11	MR. GEORGE: Could you please direct me to	
12	them?	
13	MR. PAGE: Not right now I couldn't. If	
14	you ask Mr. Bullock, I'm sure he could identify	
15	those for you.	10:44AM
16	MR. GEORGE: Move to strike Exhibit 21.	
17	Q Dr. Johnson, are there many streams within the	
18	IRW?	
19	A There are a number of springs in the in the	
20	SW17 dataset. I don't recall the exact number, but	10:45AM
21	I assume there are probably other springs that were	
22	not sampled.	
23	Q Do you recall whether or not any of those	
24	springs have been identified by Dr. Olsen as being	
25	associated with poultry waste due to their	10:45AM

380

1	A There are surprises like that, yes.
2	Q Well, let's I see a two-minute warning, and
3	I don't think I'm going to get through in two
4	minutes, so why don't we take a break before we
5	begin on this exhibit. 10:52AM
6	A Okay.
7	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the Record. The
8	time is 10:52.
9	(Following a short recess at 10:52
10	a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 11:05
11	a.m.)
12	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.
13	The time is 11:05.
14	MR. GEORGE: Mr. Page, you've put in front
15	of the witness Exhibit 22, and I have an objection 11:05AM
16	to it and move to strike it. It is, again, the
17	product of expert analysis that has been completed
18	after Dr. Olsen's report and after his deposition
19	and is untimely. It's not been included in the
20	production of his considered materials, and near as 11:06AM
21	I can tell, was not something considered by him in
22	forming the opinions expressed in his expert report.
23	I'll also note that Exhibit 22 contains some what I
24	think you will represent to be documented areas of
25	land application and that those areas are 11:06AM

381

1	inconsistent with the only information that have
2	been provided to the defendants before, which is in
3	Exhibit 14, which show no land application in this
4	area.
5	So to the extent there's been an additional 11:06AM
6	investigation by investigators working for the State
7	of Oklahoma of land use practices around the Fite
8	property, that material has not been produced, and
9	to question this witness about it is improper. So
10	move to strike Exhibit 22. 11:06AM
11	MR. PAGE: I'll just make one comment, only
12	one, is that all the information concerning land
13	application has been provided to defendants prior to
14	this deposition.
15	MR. GEORGE: Okay. Could you point me to 11:07AM
16	the information that would show land application,
17	particularly in this little
18	MR. PAGE: I don't have
19	MR. GEORGE: Hang on. Let me finish,
20	please. Particularly in the orange shaded area 11:07AM
21	along the Illinois River reflected on Exhibit 22?
22	MR. PAGE: I do not have that information
23	with me. I know that that particular location that
24	you identified on Exhibit 22 was identified by Ed
25	Fite as an area of poultry land application. 11:07AM

1	MR. GEORGE: Identified when by Ed Fite?	
2	MR. PAGE: When he was interviewed for the	
3	sampling.	
4	Q Dr. Johnson, we placed before you Exhibit 22,	
5	which is based on the aerial photo taken by the	11:07AM
6	State of Oklahoma in this case and on there taking	
7	the watershed that would encompass the cattle	
8	samples that we've been discussing today. Do you	
9	see that, sir?	
10	A Yes.	11:08AM
11	Q Also on this exhibit, which relates to the	
12	Fite property I believe, does it not, that's shown	
13	on Exhibit 3-9 of your report?	
14	A I'm sorry. The question was, is this the same	
15	location?	11:08AM
16	Q Yes.	
17	A Yes, it is.	
18	Q Okay. Also on Exhibit 22 you see there's been	
19	added, in addition to the cattle sampling locations,	
20	also a groundwater well sampling location and a	11:08AM
21	spring sampling location?	
22	A Correct.	
23	Q I'll represent to you that the spring that's	
24	shown on here was a spring that Dr. Olsen was	
25	mentioned during his deposition as being a potential	11:08AM

501

1	Q Okay, and at any point in time in those	
2	conversations, Dr. Johnson, did either Drs. Connolly	
3	or Sullivan suggest that your analysis was	
4	inconsistent with the work that they were doing on	
5	source identification? 03:24PM	
6	A No, they did not.	
7	Q Okay. Let me hand or hopefully you have in	
8	front of you Exhibits 9 and 11 to your deposition.	
9	A Okay.	
10	Q Do you recall being asked questions based upon 03:24PM	
11	a sentence or two, excerpts from Exhibit 9 titled	
12	Evaluation of Graphical and Multivariate Statistical	
13	Methods For Classification For Water Chemistry Data?	
14	A Yes, I do.	
15	Q And, Dr. Johnson, did you have an opportunity 03:25PM	
16	to review the entire text of that article last	
17	night?	
18	A I still have not read it in the detail I would	
19	if I was reviewing this as a paper, but I read it	
20	and I spent more time on it than I was than I had 03:25PM	
21	here yesterday.	
22	Q And my understanding of the questioning	
23	yesterday I want to know if it's consistent with	
24	yours was that there was a suggestion that that	
25	article supported Dr. Olsen's treatment and 03:25PM	

502

1	transformation of data in his principal component	
2	analysis; is that right?	
3	A Yes, that's my recollection as well.	
4	Q Now that you've read the entire article, do	
5	you believe that to be true? 03:25P	M
6	A No, I do not.	
7	Q Could you explain?	
8	A Yes. Okay. On Page 461, and I don't recall	
9	if this was the specific excerpt I was asked to	
10	read, but it is addressing the same issue. It's 03:26P	M
11	talking about data screening. At the bottom of the	
12	first paragraph is a few sentences under data	
13	screening. Based on these analyses, decisions were	
14	made concerning the need for and selection of	
15	appropriate transformations to achieve a better 03:27P	M
16	approximation of the normal distribution. This is	
17	important because most of the statistical most	
18	statistical analyses assumed the data are normally	
19	distributed. I agree that many, if not most,	
20	statistical analyses carry with it assumptions of 03:27P	M
21	distribution of the dataset. I do not think that	
22	PCA falls into that category. PCA is not strictly a	
23	statistical analysis. It is a linear	
24	transformation.	
25	Q Are there other portions of the article that 03:27P	M

503

1	you believe are supportive of that position?	
2	A Yes. There's a section a little farther back	
3	on Page 466. The very last paragraph of that page	
4	starts, another type of data analysis sometimes used	
5	is principal components analysis. This technique	03:27PM
6	reduces the number of dimensions present in data,	
7	and in parenthesis, reducing eleven variables to two	
8	variables in our study. The PCA-defined new	
9	variables can then be explained in a scatter	
10	diagram, and I believe they're talking about a	03:28PM
11	scores plot. Let me see. Skip down to the last	
12	sentence that's starting there. This technique,	
13	strictly speaking, is not a multivariate statistical	
14	technique but a mathematical manipulation that may	
15	provide certain amounts a certain amount of	03:28PM
16	insight into the structure of the data matrix. So	
17	that is perfectly consistent with what I just said	
18	with regard to the earlier excerpt.	
19	Q Okay, and how are these concepts relevant to	
20	the issue that you were discussing with Mr. Page on	03:28PM
21	transformations performed by Dr. Olsen?	
22	A Well, the issue goes back to to the degree	
23	to which it was necessary to do a log transform of	
24	the data. A log transform to me is necessary in	
25	those instances where the statistical method you are	03:29PM

504

1	using carries with it the assumption of normally
2	distributed data. PCA does not.
3	Q Okay. Dr. Johnson, were there other portions
4	of this article that Mr. Page did not have you read
5	that you think bear upon the issues that have been 03:29PM
6	discussed in this deposition?
7	A Yes. This particular excerpt was not with
8	regard to data transformations, but it's on Page
9	459, and it's talking about data gap filling
10	procedures and estimation of missing values, and it 03:29PM
11	says, usually the effective use of many of the
12	methods requires complete water analyses, no missing
13	data values. Missing data values may make the use
14	of graphical water chemistry techniques impossible
15	or limit the quality of the statistical analysis. 03:29PM
16	During the statistical analysis, most statistical
17	software packages replace those missing values with
18	the means of the variables or prompt the user for
19	casewise deletion of analytical data, both of which
20	are not desirable. This can bias statistical 03:30PM
21	analyses if these values represent a significant
22	number of data being analyzed, and then they go on
23	with some of the recommendations that they say work
24	better with their data.
25	Q Dr. Johnson, is that passage that you just 03:30PM

505

1	read consistent with your criticisms of some of the	
2	missing data that Dr. Olsen did not accurately	
3	address in his principal component analysis?	
4	A Yes, and I believe, if I understand, Dr.	
5	Cowan's criticism as well. 03:30	PM
6	Q Okay. All right. There's one other article,	
7	Dr. Johnson, that you were asked to read excerpts	
8	from that I believe you've now had an opportunity to	
9	read the entirety of, and that's Exhibit 11 entitled	
10	Chemometric Application in Classification and 03:30	PM
11	Assessment of Monitoring Locations of an Urban River	
12	System. Do you have that in front of you?	
13	A Yes, I do.	
14	Q Okay, and once again, Dr. Johnson, were there	
15	portions of this article that Mr. Page did not ask 03:31	PM
16	you to read that bear upon the issues that were	
17	being discussed?	
18	A Yes.	
19	Q Okay. Could you please point those out?	
20	A And, again, when Mr. Page was asking questions 03:31	PM
21	relative to this paper yesterday, I believe he was	
22	focusing on Page 392 where there's some form of a	
23	log transform on the right side of 392 and then	
24	there's the identification of a Z-transform farther	
25	down. To go back one page to Page 391, the very 03:31	PM

506

1	first paragraph says, the application of different
2	chemometric methods, and then it lists a number,
3	including PCA, aids in reducing the complexity of
4	large datasets and offers better interpretation and
5	understanding of water quality. Environmental data 03:31PM
6	are not in general normally distributed. However,
7	most of the multivariate methods are based on normal
8	distribution of the data, and then he has three
9	examples, correlation analysis, factor analysis and
10	discriminate analysis, and PCA is not listed within 03:32PM
11	that excerpt.
12	You then move to Page 394. There's a specific
13	discussion of principal components analysis and it
14	says 394, Section 2.3.2, principal component
15	analysis is a technique widely used for reducing the 03:32PM
16	dimensions of multivariate problems. As a
17	non-parametric method of classification, it makes no
18	assumptions about the underlying statistical
19	distribution.
20	Q And, Dr. Johnson, how is that relevant to the 03:32PM
21	transformations issues that we've been discussing?
22	A It supports what I said in my report, that the
23	log transform is not necessary because it's
24	principal components does not depend on the
25	assumption of normally distributed data. 03:33PM